

1 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP  
A Limited Liability Partnership  
2 Including Professional Corporations  
TENAYA RODEWALD, Cal. Bar No. 248563  
3 JAMES CHADWICK, Cal. Bar No. 157114  
CRISTINA SALVATO, Cal. Bar. No. 295898  
4 379 Lytton Avenue  
Palo Alto, California 94301-1479  
5 Telephone: 650.815.2600  
Facsimile: 650.815.2601  
6 E mail jchadwick@sheppardmullin.com  
trodewald@sheppardmullin.com  
7 csalvato@sheppardmullin.com

8 Attorneys for Intervenors FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION,  
LOS ANGELES TIMES COMMUNICATIONS LLC,  
9 CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS PARTNERSHIP L.P., THE  
CENTER FOR INVESTIGATIVE REPORTING, and  
10 CALIFORNIA NEWS PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

11  
12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
13 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

14 LOS ANGELES POLICE PROTECTIVE  
LEAGUE,

15 Petitioner,

16 v.

17 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal  
corporation; MICHEL R. MOORE, Chief of  
Police for the City of Los Angeles, and DOES  
18 1 through 20, inclusive,

19 Respondents.

Case No. 18STCP03495

**INTERVENORS' COMPLAINT IN  
INTERVENTION**

**Dept.: 85**

[Petition Filed: December 31, 2018]

20 FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION, a  
21 California non-profit, public benefit  
corporation; LOS ANGELES TIMES  
22 COMMUNICATIONS LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company; CALIFORNIA  
23 NEWSPAPERS PARTNERSHIP L.P., a  
Delaware limited partnership; THE CENTER  
24 FOR INVESTIGATIVE REPORTING,  
California non-profit, public benefit  
25 corporation; and CALIFORNIA NEWS  
PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, an association  
26 of California news organizations,

27 Intervenors.  
28

1 Real Parties in Interest and Proposed Intervenor First Amendment Coalition (“FAC”), Los  
2 Angeles Times Communications LLC (“LAT”), California Newspapers Partnership L.P. (doing  
3 business as the Southern California Newspaper Group or SCNG (“SCNG”) and Bay Area News  
4 Group (“BANG”)), The Center for Investigative Reporting, Inc. (“CIR”), and California News  
5 Publishers Association (“CNPA”) (collectively, “Intervenor”) file this Complaint in Intervention  
6 and hereby intervene in this action, alleging as follows:

### 7 INTRODUCTION

8 1. In 2018, the California Legislature passed and Governor Jerry Brown subsequently  
9 signed into law California Senate Bill 1421 (“SB 1421”), enacted as Chapter 988 of the 2017-2018  
10 Regular Session. SB 1421, which became effective January 1, 2019, amended two sections of the  
11 Penal Code concerning law enforcement personnel records (Sections 832.7 and 832.8). The new  
12 law makes records relating to incidents of (A) officer involved shootings and serious uses of force,  
13 (B) sustained findings of sexual assault, and (C) sustained findings of serious dishonesty, subject  
14 to public disclosure through the California Public Records Act (the “CPRA”). Specifically, the  
15 statute now provides:

16 Notwithstanding subdivision (a), subdivision (f) of Section 6254 of the Government Code,  
17 or any other law, ***the following peace officer or custodial officer personnel records*** and  
18 records maintained by any state or local agency ***shall not be confidential and shall be***  
***made available for public inspection*** pursuant to the California Public Records Act ...:

19 (A) A record relating to the report, investigation, or findings of ***any*** of the following:

20 (i) An incident involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or  
custodial officer.

21 (ii) An incident in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer  
22 against a person resulted in death, or in great bodily injury.

23 (B) (i) ***Any*** record relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made ... that a  
24 peace officer or custodial officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the  
public. ...

25 (C) ***Any*** record relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made ... of  
26 dishonesty by a peace officer or custodial officer directly relating to...” certain things  
“including, but not limited to, ***any*** sustained finding of perjury, false statements, filing  
false reports, destruction, falsifying, or concealing of evidence.

27 (Penal Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(1) [emphasis added].) Section 832.7(b)(2) further specifies:  
28

1 Records that shall be released pursuant to this subdivision include **all** investigative  
2 reports; photographic, audio, and video evidence; transcripts or recordings of  
3 interviews; autopsy reports; **all** materials compiled and presented for review to the  
4 district attorney or to any person or body charged with determining whether to file  
5 criminal charges against an officer in connection with an incident, or whether the  
6 officer's action was consistent with law and agency policy for purposes of  
7 discipline or administrative action, or what discipline to impose or corrective action  
8 to take; documents setting forth findings or recommended findings; and copies of  
9 disciplinary records relating to the incident, including any letters of intent to  
10 impose discipline, any documents reflecting modifications of discipline due to the  
11 Skelly or grievance process, and letters indicating final imposition of discipline or  
12 other documentation reflecting implementation of corrective action.

(Penal Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(2) [emphasis added].)

2. For some years prior to the enactment of SB 1421, such information was available  
through discovery in civil or criminal litigation, pursuant to a motion made in accordance with  
Penal Code section 1043 but not pursuant to a CPRA request.

3. On December 31, 2018, three months after SB 1421 was enacted but just one day  
before the bill was scheduled to go into effect, Petitioner Los Angeles Police Protective League  
("Petitioner" or "LAPPL") filed a Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate, Alternative Writ of  
Mandate, and Request for Stay (the "Petition") in this Court. In its Petition, LAPPL contended  
that SB 1421 is "prospective" only, which means, according to the LAPPL, that the law does not  
apply to "peace officer personnel records and information regarding incidents or reflecting  
conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019," (referred to herein as "pre-2019 records").  
Furthermore, LAPPL contends that applying SB 1421 to pre-2019 records is an impermissible  
"retroactive" application of the law. Accordingly, LAPPL sought and was granted an alternative  
writ of mandate and stay order directing Respondents City of Los Angeles ("Los Angeles" or  
"City"); Michel R. Moore, Chief of Police for the City of Los Angeles ("Moore"); and their  
agents, employees, and representatives ("Doe Respondents" and together with City and Moore,  
collectively "Respondents") to refrain from "retroactively" enforcing or applying SB 1421 by  
releasing any records relating to conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019 that are otherwise  
subject to public disclosure under the CPRA, or to show cause why they have not done so.

4. LAPPL's interpretation of SB 1421 is incorrect. First, the plain language of  
California Penal Code section 832.7 and the legislative history of SB 1421 require the application

1 of Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.7, as amended by SB 1421 (herein after “Sections 832.7 and  
2 832.8”), to all records regardless of date. Second, applying Sections 832.7 and 832.8 to pre-2019  
3 records does not constitute an impermissible “retroactive” application of the law.

4       5.       Intervenors have a direct interest in these proceedings and their outcome. FAC has  
5 an interest as a result of its support for the passage of SB 1421 and its mission to promote  
6 government accountability, prevent unnecessary governmental secrecy, and ensure enforcement of  
7 open records laws for the benefit of the public. CNPA has a similar interest, as a principal  
8 advocate for passage of SB 1421 and as an organization created to champion the ideals of a free  
9 press in our democratic society and to promote the quality and economic health of California news  
10 publishers. The public has a particularly strong interest in enforcing its right to access to the  
11 records covered by SB 1421 because they concern the conduct of law enforcement officers. (See  
12 *Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 59, 74 (*LBPOA*)  
13 [explaining that in cases concerning officer-involved shootings, “the public’s interest in the  
14 conduct of its peace officers is particularly great because such shootings often lead to severe injury  
15 or death” and the balance of interests therefore “tips strongly in favor of identity disclosure and  
16 against the personal privacy interests of the officers involved”].) LAT, SCNG, BANG and CIR,  
17 as news media organizations committed to reporting on matters of great public interest, have an  
18 interest in their ability to access this information so that they may accurately report on instances of  
19 police-involved shootings, use of force, and misconduct, and thereby serve the public interest in  
20 ensuring public oversight and accountability of law enforcement.

21       6.       Moreover, FAC, LAT, SCNG, and CIR all submitted California Public Records  
22 Act (“CPRA”) requests to Respondents seeking records containing information subject to  
23 disclosure under Penal Code section 832.7(b) (as amended by SB 1421). These requests have  
24 been denied citing the Court’s December 31, 2018, temporary stay order prohibiting the disclosure  
25 of pre-2019 records.

26       7.       Intervenors intervene in order to oppose the Petition and to request that this Court  
27 find and determine that Sections 832.7 and 832.8 apply pre-2019 records.  
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 light of recent developments where the relationship between law enforcement and members of the  
2 public has been the focus of vigorous public discussion, the public and newspapers have an  
3 exceedingly strong interest in disclosure of records concerning serious, sustained findings of  
4 misconduct by law enforcement officers. CNPA has a significant interest in ensuring that the  
5 intent of SB 1421 is faithfully executed by public agencies throughout the state and the public's  
6 right of access to the information governed by SB 1421 as well as under Section 3 of Article I of  
7 the California Constitution and California common law is not diminished.

8         10. LAT is the largest daily newspaper based in California. LAT's popular news and  
9 information website, [www.latimes.com](http://www.latimes.com), attracts a national audience. In order to ensure its ability  
10 to effectively report on matters of vital public interest, LAT regularly joins litigation defending the  
11 public's rights of access to government records and meetings. Before the Supreme Court of  
12 California, LAT vindicated the public's rights of access to the names of police officers  
13 (*Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training v. Superior Court* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 278  
14 (*POST*)) and the names of most officers involved in shootings in California (*LBPOA, supra*, 59  
15 Cal.4th 59). In recent years, LAT also ensured public access to a consultant's report on the  
16 shooting by Pasadena police of an unarmed teenager (*Pasadena Police Officers Assn. v. City of*  
17 *Pasadena* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 268) and the names of officers who pepper sprayed student  
18 protesters at the University of California, Davis (*Federated University Police Officers Assn. v.*  
19 *Superior Court* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 18). As part of these cases, the Supreme Court of  
20 California has recognized that the "public's interest in the qualifications and conduct of peace  
21 officers is substantial" (*POST, supra*, 42 Cal.4th at p. 297-299) and that "officers hold one of the  
22 most powerful positions in our society; our dependence on them is high and the potential for abuse  
23 of power is far from insignificant" (*LBPOA, supra*, 59 Cal.4th at p. 73) (internal citation  
24 omitted)). These statements have particular resonance in this litigation concerning access to police  
25 disciplinary records in the possession of the City of Los Angeles and the LAPD. Because LAT  
26 reports on the City of Los Angeles, LAT has a concrete interest in ensuring public access to all  
27 disclosable disciplinary records controlled by Respondents, including pre-2019 records. As  
28 explained further herein, LAT submitted CPRA requests to Respondents seeking pre-2019 records

1 subject to disclosure under Penal Code section 832.7(b) (as amended by SB 1421). Respondents  
2 denied LAT's requests citing the Court's December 31, 2018, temporary stay order prohibiting the  
3 disclosure of pre-2019 records.

4       11.     The California Newspapers Partnership is a Delaware Limited Partnership, which  
5 operates both the Bay Area News Group ("BANG") and the Southern California News Group  
6 ("SCNG"). BANG is a news organization that publishes two daily newspapers, The Mercury  
7 News, based in San Jose, and the East Bay Times, based in Oakland and Walnut Creek, as well as  
8 more than a dozen weekly newspapers. The organization's websites, mercurynews.com and  
9 eastbaytimes.com, attract more than half a million visitors daily. BANG regularly pursues  
10 litigation defending the public's right of access to government records and meetings. Its work  
11 relies heavily on the use of the California Public Records Act, and it has a longstanding interest in  
12 putting a spotlight on the inner workings of law enforcement, having produced the award-winning  
13 series Tainted Trials, Stolen Justice, which examined misconduct in the justice system in Santa  
14 Clara County. BANG, as a major news organization in California, has a strong interest in  
15 obtaining information made public by SB 1421. On January 6, the news organization published  
16 one of the first stories in the state using records made available by the new law. BANG's  
17 reporting detailed the history of a Burlingame police officer who sought to force women he  
18 arrested to trade sex for leniency. After the publication of the article, the San Mateo District  
19 Attorney expressed surprise that the officer had been accused of multiple incidents of such  
20 behavior, saying the DA's office had been informed of only one, and announced it would consider  
21 reopening an earlier investigation of the officer. Given this, BANG has a direct interest in  
22 bringing similar stories to light in Los Angeles.

23       12.     SCNG publishes eleven daily newspapers, 20 weeklies and four magazines in one  
24 of the world's largest metro areas. From Long Beach to the San Fernando and San Gabriel  
25 Valleys, to the beaches of Orange County to the vast Inland Empire, SCNG's newspapers,  
26 including The Orange County Register, The Press-Enterprise, Los Angeles Daily News and Long  
27 Beach Press-Telegram, have a long and well-established history of service to their communities.  
28 Each of the newspapers comprising the Southern California News Group maintains a large and

1 loyal subscriber base of readers who are well-served by SCNG's diligent public interest and  
2 investigative journalism. SCNG's publications have been recognized by state and national  
3 organizations for breaking news, public service, and investigative reporting, including a Pulitzer  
4 prize for local reporting for the Daily Breeze in 2015. As explained further herein, SCNG  
5 submitted a CPRA request to Respondents seeking pre-2019 records subject to disclosure under  
6 Penal Code section 832.7(b) (as amended by SB 1421). Respondents denied SCNG's request  
7 citing the Court's December 31, 2018, temporary stay order prohibiting the disclosure of pre-2019  
8 records.

9       13. CIR, a California non-profit, public benefit corporation founded in 1977, is the  
10 nation's first nonprofit investigative newsroom. CIR produces investigative journalism for its  
11 website Reveal, <https://www.revealnews.org>, the Reveal national public radio show and podcast,  
12 and various documentary projects. CIR is deeply committed to ensuring that the public's right to  
13 know is well-protected. It consistently pursues this mission by reporting on matters of public  
14 importance, regularly using public records laws around the country to accomplish its reporting,  
15 and joining initiatives that support the public's right. CIR is therefore squarely interested in  
16 ensuring that SB 1421 is correctly applied by requiring that public agencies follow through on  
17 their obligations to disclose information. More specifically as to the subject matter of the statute,  
18 CIR regularly reports on information related to police misconduct, law enforcement's use of  
19 deadly force, uneven application of the law by police, as well as internal corruption, all of which  
20 may become more transparent under the application of this new law. As explained further herein,  
21 CIR submitted a CPRA request to Respondents seeking pre-2019 records subject to disclosure  
22 under Penal Code section 832.7(b) (as amended by SB 1421). Respondents have not yet  
23 responded to CIR's request.

24       14. LAPPL alleges in the Petition that it is an employee organization as defined in  
25 Government Code section 3500 et seq., recognized to represent all police officers, police  
26 detectives, sergeants and lieutenants employed by the City with regard to all matters concerning  
27 wages, hours and working conditions. LAPPL further alleges that its represented employees are  
28 peace officers as defined in Penal Code sections 830.1.



15. The City is a municipal corporation operating under the laws of the State of California. LAPPL alleges in the Petition that the City was, at all relevant times, a local employing agency within the meaning of Penal Code section 832.5 et seq. maintaining peace officer personnel information, as well as a local agency within the meaning of the CPRA, Government Code section 6252.

16. Moore is, and at all relevant times was, the Chief of Police for the City of Los Angeles. LAPPL alleges in the Petition that Moore is charged with the general supervision, administration and management of the LAPD.

17. LAPPL alleges that Doe Respondents were at all relevant times the agents, servants and employees of Respondent City acting within the scope of their authority with the permission and consent of the City.

## JURISDICTION

18. This Court has original jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the California Constitution article VI, section 10 and California Code of Civil Procedure sections 387 and 1085.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19. Recognizing the public’s right to information about serious police misconduct, officer-involved shootings, and other serious uses of force by law enforcement officers, in 2018 the California Legislature passed, and former Governor Jerry Brown signed into law SB 1421. The new law expands access to certain records by making records relating to incidents of (A) officer involved shootings and serious uses of force, (B) sustained findings of sexual assault, and (C) sustained findings of serious dishonesty, subject to public disclosure through the California Public Records Act (the “CPRA”). Specifically, the statute now provides:

Notwithstanding subdivision (a), subdivision (f) of Section 6254 of the Government Code, or any other law, ***the following peace officer or custodial officer personnel records*** and records maintained by any state or local agency ***shall not be confidential and shall be made available for public inspection*** pursuant to the California Public Records Act ...:

(A) A record relating to the report, investigation, or findings of **any** of the following:

(i) An incident involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer.

1 (ii) An incident in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer  
2 against a person resulted in death, or in great bodily injury.

3 (B) (i) **Any** record relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made ... that a  
4 peace officer or custodial officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the  
5 public. ...

6 (C) **Any** record relating to an incident in which a sustained finding was made ... of  
7 dishonesty by a peace officer or custodial officer directly relating to..." certain things  
8 "including, but not limited to, **any** sustained finding of perjury, false statements, filing  
9 false reports, destruction, falsifying, or concealing of evidence.

10 (Penal Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(1) [emphasis added].) Section 832.7(b)(2) further specifies:

11 Records that shall be released pursuant to this subdivision include **all** investigative  
12 reports; photographic, audio, and video evidence; transcripts or recordings of  
13 interviews; autopsy reports; **all** materials compiled and presented for review to the  
14 district attorney or to any person or body charged with determining whether to file  
15 criminal charges against an officer in connection with an incident, or whether the  
16 officer's action was consistent with law and agency policy for purposes of  
17 discipline or administrative action, or what discipline to impose or corrective action  
18 to take; documents setting forth findings or recommended findings; and copies of  
19 disciplinary records relating to the incident, including any letters of intent to  
20 impose discipline, any documents reflecting modifications of discipline due to the  
21 Skelly or grievance process, and letters indicating final imposition of discipline or  
22 other documentation reflecting implementation of corrective action.

23 (Penal Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(2) [emphasis added].)

24 20. The declaration of intent in SB 1421 reflects the Legislature's findings that the  
25 public has a particularly strong interest in disclosure of records concerning police misconduct and  
26 officer-involved shootings:

27 (a) Peace officers help to provide one of our state's most fundamental  
28 government services. To empower peace officers to fulfill their  
mission, the people of California vest them with extraordinary authority  
— the powers to detain, search, arrest, and use deadly force. Our society  
depends on peace officers' faithful exercise of that authority. Misuse of  
that authority can lead to grave constitutional violations, harms to  
liberty and the inherent sanctity of human life, as well as significant  
public unrest.

(b) The public has a right to know all about serious police misconduct, as  
well as about officer-involved shootings and other serious uses of force.  
Concealing crucial public safety matters such as officer violations of  
civilians' rights, or inquiries into deadly use of force incidents,  
undercuts the public's faith in the legitimacy of law enforcement,  
makes it harder for tens of thousands of hardworking peace officers to  
do their jobs, and endangers public safety.

(SB 1421, § 1.)

1           21.     SB 1421 also provides limited exceptions to public disclosure. It excepts from  
2 disclosure certain personal data including home addresses, telephone numbers, and allows  
3 government agencies to redact the identities of officers' family members. Government agencies  
4 may also withhold records when disclosure would pose a significant danger to the officer in  
5 question or hinder an ongoing investigation.

6           22.     SB 1421 was passed on August 31, 2018, signed by former Governor Brown on  
7 September 30, 2018, and enacted as Chapter 988 of the 2017-2018 Regular Session. It amended  
8 Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8 and became effective on January 1, 2019.

9           23.     On December 31, 2018, LAPPL filed a petition with this Court (the "Petition")  
10 seeking a determination that SB 1421 and Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8, as amended by  
11 SB 1421, is not applicable to "peace officer personnel records and information regarding incidents  
12 or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019," and a preemptory writ of mandate  
13 prohibiting the disclosure of such records. LAPPL also asked the Court to issue an alternative writ  
14 of mandate and an immediate order staying or enjoining any release of pre-2019 records during  
15 the pendency of these proceedings, which the Court granted on December 31, 2018. In its  
16 Petition, LAPPL alleged that Moore, in his official capacity, wrote a letter to Senator Nancy  
17 Skinner on December 3, 2018, expressing concern that SB 1421 might be interpreted as  
18 "retroactive," and if applied in a retroactive manner would impose an unreasonable burden on  
19 LAPD. LAPPL also alleged that the LAPD had confirmed in a letter dated December 26, 2018,  
20 that absent a stay or other ruling from the California Supreme Court or another court of competent  
21 jurisdiction, it intended to apply SB 1421 to pre-2019 records by making the following types of  
22 records, including pre-2019 records, available by public records request beginning on January 1,  
23 2019: records regarding officer-involved shootings, records regarding officers' use of force  
24 resulting in death or great bodily injury, and sustained findings of sexual assault or dishonesty  
25 committed by peace officers.

26           24.     LAPPL's Petition contends that police officers hold a protected right to privacy in  
27 the information contained in their pre-2019 personnel files and agency records regarding pre-2019  
28 incidents despite the enactment of SB 1421. LAPPL further contends that SB 1421 does not

1 contain any express provision or language “requiring retroactivity” or any clear indication that the  
2 Legislature intended the statute to operate “retroactively,” which LAPPL defines as application to  
3 peace officer personnel records and information which arose out of incidents involving peace  
4 officer conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019. LAPPL therefore contends that the Court  
5 should hold that SB 1421 does not permit disclosure of “peace officer personnel records and  
6 information regarding incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019” under the  
7 CPRA.

8         25.       Intervenors have strong and direct interests in intervening in this proceeding to  
9 prevent LAPPL from obtaining a final writ of mandate by this Court that would prevent the  
10 disclosure of information subject to SB 1421 by a CPRA request, including records and  
11 information regarding incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019, and to  
12 ensure that the Respondents and their agents appropriately enforce and comply with Sections  
13 832.7 and 832.8.

14         26.       FAC is a nonprofit public benefit corporation dedicated to advancing the public’s  
15 right to participate in government and access information regarding the conduct of the people’s  
16 business. The public has a particularly strong interest in accessing public records concerning  
17 serious misconduct and uses of force by law enforcement officers, and FAC is interested in  
18 promoting laws and policies that increase public access to such information.

19         27.       FAC was active in supporting SB 1421. On April 9, 2018, FAC sent an open letter  
20 to Senator Nancy Skinner, the bill’s author, expressing its strong support of SB 1421. That same  
21 day, FAC posted the letter on its website, urging others to also support the bill. FAC is listed in  
22 the official legislative analyses among the organizations that publicly supported SB 1421. FAC’s  
23 support of SB 1421 reflects its mission to advance transparency and accountability of government  
24 and government employees, including law enforcement officers, and to prevent government  
25 secrecy and censorship. Moreover, on January 10, 2019, FAC submitted a CPRA request, through  
26 the LAPD’s online public records request portal, by email and by letter delivered via U.S. mail to  
27 Moore, for LAPD records from 2017 and 2018 that contain information subject to SB 1421. Todd  
28 Gaydowski of the City Clerk’s Office responded to this request by email on January 10, 2019,

1 claiming that the 2017 and 2018 police records had not been transferred to the City Records  
2 Center yet, and that FAC must submit its request through LAPD's online public records request  
3 portal to receive a necessary release of the records from LAPD. As noted, FAC had submitted its  
4 request via the online portal. On January 17, 2019, the City responded that it could not provide  
5 the requested records because Respondents are prohibited from disclosing or providing any  
6 records relating to incidents occurring before January 1, 2019, due to the Court's December 31,  
7 2018 temporary stay Order in these proceedings prohibiting the City from applying Penal Code  
8 sections 832.7 and 832.8 (as modified by SB 1421) "in any manner which would result in the  
9 disclosure or production of peace officer personnel records and information regarding incidents or  
10 reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019."

11       28. CNPA was a co-sponsor of SB 1421 from its inception. CNPA's arguments in  
12 support of SB 1421 are expressly referenced and quoted in the legislative history of the bill. SB  
13 1421 provides public access to records vital to the mission of CNPA's members in providing  
14 information that is, as the Supreme Court of California has recognized, necessary to inform the  
15 public on matters of vital and legitimate public concern. If Penal Code section 832.7 (as amended  
16 by SB 1421) is interpreted to prohibit the disclosure of records relating to incidents or conduct  
17 before January 1, 2019, this would severely limit CNPA members' ability to investigate and report  
18 stories of serious police misconduct, shootings and serious uses of force.

19       29. As a major news organization in California, and as a media organization that  
20 regularly reports on the LAPD, LAT has a direct interest in ensuring public access to the  
21 information and reports addressed by SB 1421, including records relating to incidents occurring  
22 before January 1, 2019, so that it may report on matters of public interest in Los Angeles regarding  
23 police misconduct and uses of deadly force by peace officers.

24       30. On January 1, 2019, LAT submitted two CPRA requests to LAPD via email and  
25 the City's online portal. One request sought electronic records of incidents subject to SB 1421 for  
26 all current and former sworn officers employed by LAPD, and the other request sought letters of  
27 discipline from Jan. 1, 2014, through Jan. 1, 2019, for current and former sworn officers employed  
28 by LAPD relating to reports, investigations, or findings from incidents covered by SB 1421. On

1 January 10, 2019, the LAPD responded stating that Respondents are prohibited from disclosing or  
2 providing any records relating to incidents occurring before January 1, 2019, due to the Court's  
3 December 31, 2018 temporary stay Order in these proceedings prohibiting the City from applying  
4 Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8 (as modified by SB 1421) "in any manner which would  
5 result in the disclosure or production of peace officer personnel records and information regarding  
6 incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019."

7         31. On January 1, 2019, the LAT also submitted a CPRA request to the Los Angeles  
8 Port Police seeking letters of discipline from Jan. 1, 2014, through Jan. 1, 2019, for current and  
9 former sworn officers employed by LAPD relating to reports, investigations, or findings from  
10 incidents covered by SB 1421. Thomas E. Gazsi, Chief of Police for the Los Angeles Port Police,  
11 responded to LAT's CPRA request on January 8, 2019, stating that it was prohibited from  
12 disclosing or providing any records relating to incidents occurring before January 1, 2019, due to  
13 the Court's December 31, 2018 temporary stay Order in these proceedings prohibiting the City  
14 from applying Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8 (as modified by SB 1421) "in any manner  
15 which would result in the disclosure or production of peace officer personnel records and  
16 information regarding incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019."

17         32. As a major news content provider in the five-county Los Angeles metropolitan  
18 area, regularly engaged in reporting on LAPD, SCNG has a direct interest in obtaining access to  
19 LAPD records addressed by SB 1421, including records relating to incidents occurring before  
20 January 1, 2019, so that it can provide readers with the best local news coverage in the Los  
21 Angeles area.

22         33. Moreover, SCNG has a direct interest in these proceedings because on January 1,  
23 2019, it submitted a CPRA request to LAPD for records of the LAPD officer-involved shootings  
24 of Ezell Ford, Elizabeth Tollison, and Eric Rivera, which occurred before January 1, 2019. On  
25 January 10, 2019, the LAPD's CPRA Unit responded to SCNG's request via email that it was  
26 prohibited from disclosing or providing any records relating to incidents occurring before January  
27 1, 2019, due to the Court's December 31, 2018 temporary stay Order in these proceedings  
28 prohibiting the City from applying Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8 (as modified by SB 1421)

1 “in any manner which would result in the disclosure or production of peace officer personnel  
2 records and information regarding incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1,  
3 2019.”

4 34. As one of the nation’s longest operating and most prominent nonprofit investigative  
5 journalism organizations, CIR is dedicated to holding the government accountable and revealing  
6 threats to public safety through the dissemination and publication of information and news in the  
7 public’s interest. As such, CIR has a strong interest in obtaining access to the information and  
8 records addressed under SB 1421 regarding serious police misconduct and use of deadly force by  
9 peace officers, including records relating to incidents occurring before January 1, 2019. CIR has a  
10 direct interest in ensuring its access to these records so that it can publicly report on these matters  
11 of public interest.

12 35. Additionally, CIR has a direct interest in this action because on January 14, 2019,  
13 CIR submitted a CPRA request to the LAPD seeking records relating to (1) any incidents in 2018  
14 involving the discharge of a firearm at a person by a peace officer or custodial officer; (2) any  
15 incidents in 2018 in which the use of force by a peace officer or custodial officer against a person  
16 resulted in death or in great bodily injury; and (3) any incidents in 2018 in which a sustained  
17 finding was made by any law enforcement agency or oversight agency that a peace officer or  
18 custodial officer engaged in sexual assault involving a member of the public. As of the date of  
19 this filing, CIR had not received a response from Respondents.

20 36. On January 17, 2019, Intervenors filed an Ex Parte Application for Leave to  
21 Intervene, or in the Alternative, for an Order Shortening Time to intervene by noticed motion. On  
22 January 18, 2019, the Court heard argument on Intervenors’ Application. The Court denied  
23 Intervenors’ request to proceed by noticed motion by instead deciding the Ex Parte Application at  
24 the hearing. As to that Application, the Court denied Intervenors’ application to intervene as of  
25 right. The Court granted Intervenors’ request for permissive intervention, but ruled that  
26 Intervenors could intervene only on two conditions: (1) that they file a joint opposition to  
27  
28

1 LAPPL's Petition with the ACLU intervenors, and (2) that they may not seek attorneys'  
2 fees.<sup>1</sup> (Jan. 18, 2019 Minute Order.)

3 **THE INTERVENORS' HAVE THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE, OR PERMISSIVE**  
4 **INTERVENTION IS WARRANTED**

5 37. Intervenors incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 36 above.

6 38. Intervenors are entitled to intervene by right, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure  
7 section 387, subdivision (d)(1), because they have an interest relating to the property or transaction  
8 that is the subject of the pending Petition, their ability to protect that interest may be impaired or  
9 impeded by the disposition of the Petition, their interests are not adequately represented (if they  
10 are represented at all) by the existing parties, and the Intervenors' application is timely.

11 39. Intervenors have a direct interest in the subject of this action, because they have a  
12 vital interest in ensuring that Respondents faithfully enforce Sections 832.7 and 832.8 by making  
13 all public records described in SB 1421, including records relating to incidents occurring before  
14 January 1, 2019, available for review by the public through the CPRA. In addition, Intervenors  
15 have filed CPRA requests seeking records relating to incidents occurring before January 1, 2019.  
16 Intervenors have been denied the requested documents on the basis of the Court's current Stay  
17 order.

18 40. One of FAC's missions is advancing the public's right to participate in government  
19 and access information regarding the conduct of the people's business, including information  
20 regarding serious misconduct and uses of force by LAPD officers. FAC also has a particular  
21 interest in ensuring that Respondents enforce and comply with Sections 832.7 and 832.8 because  
22 FAC actively supported SB 1421 when the bill was in the California Legislature. As a co-sponsor  
23 of SB 1421 and as the principal association serving newspapers throughout the State of California,  
24 CNPA also has a direct interest in ensuring appropriate and meaningful application and  
25 enforcement of Sections 832.7 and 832.8.

---

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Intervenors object to these rulings. Intervenors have removed their request for attorneys'  
28 fees from this Complaint in Intervention under protest, and only because they have been required  
to do so by the Court. Intervenors reserve all rights to challenge the Court's rulings by appeal or  
other appropriate means.



1           41.     LAT, SCNG, BANG and CIR each have an interest in ensuring their ability to fully  
2 and accurately report on matters of public interest and concern regarding the City of Los Angeles  
3 by having access to the information and reports that SB 1421 addresses, including records relating  
4 to incidents occurring before January 1, 2019. Moreover, LAT has a demonstrated interest in SB  
5 1421 given its involvement in several cases involving the public's right to access information  
6 regarding police misconduct and use of deadly force.

7           42.     LAT, SCNG, FAC, and CIR further have a direct interest in intervening given their  
8 pending and denied requests for access to records, including records relating to incidents occurring  
9 before January 1, 2019, subject to disclosure under SB 1421.

10          43.     Intervenors' ability to protect these interests will be impaired, and indeed will be  
11 largely eviscerated, by an adverse determination of the Petition. If the LAPPL's position is  
12 adopted and enforce, Intervenors will be deprived of access to records of great public interest and  
13 concern, and will be denied access to records they have already requested.

14          44.     Intervenors interests are not and will not be adequately represented by any of the  
15 existing parties. Petitioner is pursuing a position and relief directly adverse to those of the  
16 Intervenors. Respondents, the City of Los Angeles and Chief of Police Michel Moore, cannot  
17 adequately represent Intervenors' interest because their primary objective is to comply with the  
18 CPRA, not to vindicate the public's and the press's right of access to government records. In fact,  
19 Petitioner's request that SB 1421 apply only to records of conduct occurring after January 1, 2019  
20 would reduce the administrative burden on the Respondents, as they would not be required to  
21 provide records related to conduct occurring before January 1, 2019 in response to Public Records  
22 Act requests. Moreover, in similar actions (including a nearly identical petition brought in the  
23 California Supreme Court by counsel for Petitioners on behalf of another law enforcement union),  
24 the Respondents have not opposed the petitions. Thus, Respondents interests are not directly  
25 opposed to Petitioner's and may even be aligned with Petitioner's. Respondents therefore cannot  
26 adequately represent the interests of the Intervenors.

27          45.     Finally, Intervenors' request to intervene is and was timely, as described below.  
28

1           46.     To the extent Intervenor's are not entitled to intervene by right, they should be  
2 permitted to intervene pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 387, subdivision (d)(2) because  
3 they have direct and significant interests in this action, as described in the foregoing paragraphs,  
4 their inclusion will not enlarge the scope of this lawsuit, their need to intervene outweighs the  
5 current parties' right to litigate on their own terms, and they have made timely application to  
6 intervene.

7           47.     Intervention by the Intervenor's will not enlarge the scope of this lawsuit, because  
8 the only relief sought by the Intervenor's is the denial of the Petition and a determination of the  
9 issue presented by the Petition, i.e. whether the amendments enacted by SB 1421 provide the  
10 public with a right of access to records of incidents and conduct occurring prior to January 1,  
11 2019. Permitting Intervenor's to participate will not inject new factual issues, because the issues  
12 presented by the Petition are questions of law, to be determined based on the basis of the language  
13 of the statutory amendments and, if necessary, the legislative history of the amendments. In  
14 addition, permitting intervention need not delay the proceedings, and Intervenor's seek leave to  
15 intervene in a manner that will preserve the briefing and hearing schedule previously established  
16 by the Court.

17           48.     Intervenor's need to intervene outweighs the current parties' right to litigate on  
18 their own terms. Intervenor's seek to enforce and vindicate not only their own rights, but the rights  
19 of the public generally to access to the records intended by the Legislature to be made public  
20 through the enactment of SB 1421. The records at issue contain information that the California  
21 Supreme Court has recognized as being of profound public importance and concern. (*POST*,  
22 *supra*, 42 Cal.4th at p. 297-299; *LBPOA*, *supra*, 59 Cal.4th at p. 73.) Moreover, the "terms" on  
23 which Petitioner seeks to litigate the question presented the Petition are fundamentally inequitable.  
24 It is likely that in the absence of the participation of the Intervenor's the Petition will not be  
25 effectively opposed, and thus that a question of profound public concern will be resolved in a  
26 proceeding that provides no opportunity for the consideration of opposing authority, evidence, or  
27 argument. This is obviously precisely what Petitioner seeks. Its efforts to avoid meaningful  
28

1 consideration of the merits of the Petition warrant no consideration in determining whether  
2 intervention is warranted.

3 49. Intervention is timely, particularly given that Petitioners provided no notice to the  
4 Intervenors of this action, despite the fact that it was filed after some of the present Intervenors  
5 had filed a motion for leave to intervene in the Supreme Court action filed by counsel for  
6 Petitioner. Intervenors have acted as promptly as possible, have not in any way delayed their  
7 effort to intervene, and sought to intervene in a manner that will preserve the briefing and hearing  
8 schedule established by the Court.

9 50. Although they had months to pursue the resolution of the question presented by the  
10 Petition, Petitioner did not file it until December 31, 2018. Intervenors only learned of LAPPL's  
11 Petition on or after January 2, 2019. Opposition briefs were originally due January 22, 2019, and  
12 the hearing for LAPPL's Petition is scheduled for February 5, 2019.

13 51. In order to present a noticed motion for leave to intervene in accordance with Code  
14 of Civil Procedure section 1005(b), Intervenors would have had to have served and filed all  
15 supporting papers seeking leave to intervene by January 11, 2019, only seven court days after  
16 learning of LAPPL's petition. Given Intervenors need to coordinate their participation in this  
17 application, to engage counsel, and to adequately prepare their papers, an earlier presentation of  
18 their application to intervene was not possible. Furthermore, Intervenors' Ex Parte Application  
19 sought, in the alternative, that the Court shorten time to hear Intervenor's motion to intervene by  
20 noticed motion. The Court denied Intervenors' request to proceed by noticed motion by instead  
21 deciding Intervenors' Ex Parte Application to intervene on the merits. (Jan. 18, 2019 Minute  
22 Order.) Thus, Intervenor's request to intervene was timely.

23 **THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE SB 1421 WAS INTENDED**  
24 **TO APPLY TO PRE-2019 RECORDS, AND IT APPLICATION TO THOSE**  
**RECORDS IS CONSISTENT WITH CALIFORNIA LAW**

25 52. Intervenors incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 51 above.

26 53. LAPPL contends that SB 1421 cannot and should not apply "retroactively" to  
27 records and conduct pre-dating January 1, 2019 because it alleges that peace officers hold a vested  
28 right to privacy and confidentiality in this information.

1           54.     The plain language of Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8, as well as SB 1421 and  
2 the CPRA, however, make clear that the law applies to any and all records containing information  
3 delineated in SB 1421, regardless of when the records were created or the conduct occurred.

4           55.     In addition, the Legislature intended SB 1421 to apply broadly to records and files  
5 regarding peace officer conduct regardless of when the conduct occurred or when the records were  
6 created. First, the Legislature did not impose any temporal restrictions to the records to which SB  
7 1421 applies despite its understanding, as shown in the legislative history, that the CPRA defines  
8 records broadly as either subject to access or exempt from disclosure, and without temporal  
9 limitation except in the case of Governor's office records. Second, the legislative history shows  
10 that the Legislature recognized from the outset that SB 1421 would apply to pre-2019 records and  
11 passed it with that understanding. Third, the Legislature passed SB 1421 in the context of public  
12 debate regarding access to information on police misconduct and use of force, and the legislative  
13 history specifically refers to incidents in which members of the public were thwarted from  
14 obtaining meaningful information regarding past incidents and investigations of use of force by  
15 police—information that would not be available if the Legislation does not apply to pre-2019  
16 records.

17           56.     SB 1421 and Sections 832.7 and 832.8, moreover, do not affect any vested rights  
18 because peace officers have never had a constitutional or statutory right to maintain the  
19 confidentiality of the information regarding use of force or sustained findings of serious  
20 misconduct or sexual assault contained in personnel files. Rather than creating an unconditional  
21 right of privacy or confidentiality to this information, Sections 832.7 and 832.8, prior to  
22 amendment, merely provided procedural protections governing the disclosure of personnel  
23 records. Such information has always been subject to disclosure in criminal and civil litigation by  
24 way of Evidence Code sections 1043 and 1045. The amendments to Penal Code sections 832.7  
25 and 832.8 resulting from the enactment of SB 1421 simply expand procedures that can be utilized  
26 to obtain and disclose certain categories of information by allowing disclosure through CPRA  
27 requests in addition to litigation discovery requests and orders.

28

1           57.     Preventing the application of SB 1421 and Sections 832.7 and 832.8 to records  
2 regarding incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019 would severely erode  
3 the purpose of SB 1421, which is to promote the public's right to know about all serious police  
4 misconduct, officer-involved shootings, and other serious uses of force by police, in contravention  
5 of the plain language of the amendments to Sections 832.7 and 832.8 and in contravention of the  
6 intent of the Legislature. Thus, LAPPL's Petition is without merit and should be denied.

7                   **THE COURT SHOULD MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE**  
8                   **AMENDMENTS ENACTED BY SB 1421 APPLY TO PRE-2019 RECORDS**

9           58.     Intervenors incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 56 above.

10           59.     Intervenors LAT, FAC and SCNG have requested and been denied access to pre-  
11 2019 records pursuant to SB 1421 and the CPRA by Respondents, Intervenor CIR has not  
12 received any substantive response to its CPRA requests for such documents. The denial of access  
13 to these records conflicts with the application of SB 1421 and violates the CPRA. According to  
14 Sections 832.7 and 832.8 and the CPRA, all public records containing information regarding  
15 officer-involved shootings, uses of deadly force by a peace officer, and sustained findings of  
16 sexual assault or serious misconduct by a peace officer must be disclosed upon request, subject to  
17 limited exceptions. Intervenors therefore respectfully request that this Court make a determination  
18 that SB 1421 and Sections 832.7 and 832.8 apply to pre-2019 records.

19                   **RELIEF SOUGHT**

20           WHEREFORE, FAC, LAT, CIR, BANG, SCNG, and CNPA pray for judgment as  
21 follows:

- 22           1.     For an Order DENYING LAPPL's Petition and refusing to issue the writ of  
23 mandate sought by LAPPL;
- 24           2.     For an Order VACATING the stay Ordered by the Court on December 31, 2018;
- 25           3.     For a declarations that SB 1421 and California Penal Code sections 832.7 and  
26 832.8, as amended by SB 1421, apply to records created before January 1, 2019 and records  
27 regarding incidents or reflecting conduct occurring prior to January 1, 2019;
- 28

1           4.       ~~For costs and attorneys' fees as permitted by Government Code section 6259 or~~  
2 ~~Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 or as otherwise provided for by law;~~<sup>2</sup>

3           5.       For judgment accordingly; and

4           6.       For costs of suit and for such other relief as the Court deems just.

5 Dated: January 23, 2019

6 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

7  
8 By

  
TENAYA RODEWALD  
JAMES CHADWICK  
CRISTINA SALVATO  
Attorneys for Intervenors  
FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION, LOS  
ANGELES TIMES COMMUNICATIONS LLC,  
CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPERS PARTNERSHIP  
L.P., THE CENTER FOR INVESTIGATIVE  
REPORTING, and CALIFORNIA NEWS  
PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24           <sup>2</sup> On January 17, 2019, Intervenors filed an Ex Parte Application for Leave to Intervene,  
25 or in the Alternative, for an Order Shortening Time to intervene by noticed motion. On January  
26 18, 2019, the Court denied Intervenors' request to proceed by noticed motion by instead deciding  
27 the Ex Parte Application at the hearing. As to that Application, the Court denied Intervenors'  
28 application to intervene as of right. The Court granted Intervenors' request for permissive  
intervention, but ruled that Intervenors could intervene only on two conditions: (1) that they file a  
joint opposition to LAPPL's Petition with the ACLU intervenors, and (2) that they may not seek  
attorneys' fees. (Jan. 18, 2019 Minute Order.) Intervenors object to these rulings. Intervenors  
have removed their request for attorneys' fees under protest, and only because they have been  
required to do so by the Court. Intervenors reserve all rights to challenge the Court's rulings by  
appeal or other appropriate means.

1 PROOF OF SERVICE

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

3 At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am  
4 employed in the County of Santa Clara, State of California. My business address is 379 Lytton  
Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301-1479.

5 On January 23, 2019, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as  
6 **INTERVENORS' COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION** on the interested parties in this action  
as follows:

7 Richard A. Levine  
8 Rains Lucia Stern St. Phalle & Silver, PC  
rlevine@rlslawvers.com

*Attorneys for Petitioner Los Angeles Police  
Protective League*

9 Soraya Kelly  
10 Julie Raffish  
City of Los Angeles  
11 soraya.kelly@lacity.org  
julie.raffish@lacity.org

*Attorneys for Respondents City of Los Angeles;  
Michel R. Moore*

12 Peter Bibring  
13 Melanie P. Ochoa  
Rekha Arulanantham  
14 pbibring@aclusocal.org  
mpochoa@aclusocal.org  
15 rarulanantham@aclusocal.org

*Attorneys for Intervenors ACLU of Southern  
California  
and Valerie Rivera*

16 **BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION:** Based on a court order or an  
17 agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the  
document(s) to be sent from e-mail address rregnier@sheppardmullin.com to the persons at the e-  
18 mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the  
transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

19 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
20 foregoing is true and correct.

21 Executed on January 23, 2019, at Palo Alto, California.

22  
23   
24 Robin P. Regnier